

Serial No. 10/712,401
40983.0500

REMARKS

First, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended in the interview of August 13, 2007, in which Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed the various rejections, Lo and Maxel. The following remarks are provided in light of the interview.

In the Office Action mailed May 15, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-12 and 17-20 pending in the application. Claims 3, 5, 8-12, and 17-20 are cancelled and claims 1 and 6-7 are amended herein. No new matter is presented by the amendments. Claims 1-2, 4, and 6-7 (1 independent claim; 5 total claims) remain pending in the application. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims in view of the following remarks.

§ 112 Rejection

Claims 3, 11, and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In response, claims 3, 11, and 17-20 are cancelled herein. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this § 112 rejection.

§ 103 Rejections

As a preliminary matter, Applicant has cancelled claims 3, 5, 8-12, and 17-20 herein to focus the prosecution on independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2, 4, and 6-7.

Claims 1-2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lo (U.S. Patent No. 5,410,798) in view of Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,094,383); Claims 1-2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lo in view of Maxel (U.S. Patent No. 4,618,149); and Claims 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lo in view of Anderson et al. further in view of Bliss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,776,723). Applicant respectfully traverses.

As amended, independent claim 1 recites "a faceplate aperture **distinct from said at least one body aperture**, said faceplate aperture **providing access to said hollow space**." This feature is clearly shown in FIG. 1 and described at least in paragraph [0042].

Because independent claim 1 recites at least one body aperture **and** a faceplate aperture distinct therefrom, the independent claim requires at least two apertures. At most, Lo has one aperture, namely, open top portion 24. Cavity 261 in Lo is not an aperture but rather, as clearly show in FIG. 2 of Lo, and described at least at column 3, lines 5-6, is a recession to receive striking plate 21.

Serial No. 10/712,401
40983.0500

However, even assuming, *arguendo*, cavity 261 is an aperture, access to a hollow space defined by an inner surface of an aperture filler matrix, as claimed, is not feasible in Lo. Specifically, in Lo, bowl-shaped laminated member 30 and sheet of carbon fiber composite material 50 connect integrally to each other, the result defining enclosed chamber 32.¹ Upon heating, the mixture in expansible pocket 40, expansible pocket 40 being disposed within enclosed chamber 32, reacts to produce nitrogen gas. Expansible pocket 40 is thereby swelled ("balloon-like") and bowl-shaped laminated member 30 is forced to attach to metal hollow casing 20. See e.g., column 3, lines 23-38. It is thus by necessity that there is not access to the hollow space defined by enclosed chamber 32. Enclosed chamber 32 must be just that – completely closed and inaccessible. Were it not, the nitrogen gas and swelled expansible pocket 40 would not force bowl-shaped laminated member 30 to attach to metal hollow casing 20. Rather, the nitrogen gas and swelled expansible pocket 40 would escape through any opening in chamber 32.

Moreover, combining Lo with Maxel would not work, much less result in the invention as presently claimed. Specifically, if the faceplate aperture in Maxel was used with Lo, the nitrogen gas and swelled expansible pocket 40 in Lo would force bowl-shaped laminated member 30 in Lo into the faceplate aperture, thereby filling and eliminating it. Moreover, notwithstanding a detachable faceplate in Maxel, the result of combining Lo with Maxel would still not provide access to the hollow space defined by enclosed chamber 32 in Lo for the reasons provided above; because enclosed chamber 32 must be just that – completely closed and inaccessible.

Accordingly, neither Lo, nor Lo with Maxel, teach or suggest "a faceplate aperture distinct from said at least one body aperture, said faceplate aperture providing access to said hollow space."

As amended, independent claim 1 further recites "**a tuning weight attached to an interior surface of said body combination; a faceplate; and wherein said body frame structure having a faceplate aperture distinct from said at least one body aperture, said faceplate aperture providing access to said hollow space and said tuning weight.**" This feature is clearly shown in FIG. 1 and described at least in paragraphs [0042] and [0043].

¹ On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner characterized the bowl-shaped laminated member 30 and the sheet of carbon fiber composite material 50 as together making up the aperture filler matrix.

Serial No. 10/712,401
40983.0500

The Examiner acknowledges that Lo does not disclose the club head having a tuning weight, but instead cites Bliss as disclosing this claim limitation. However, while Bliss may disclose a weight member disposed along the interior surface of a bottom wall of a club head, access thereto is not disclosed in Bliss. As shown in FIGS. 2-7 of Bliss, the club head in Bliss is completely closed and inaccessible. And similar to above, combining Lo with Bliss would not work, much less result in the invention as presently claimed because there can not be access to the hollow space defined by enclosed chamber 32 in Lo. Access thereto would mean the nitrogen gas and swelled expansible pocket 40 would not force bowl-shaped laminated member 30 to attach to metal hollow casing 20. Rather, the nitrogen gas and swelled expansible pocket 40 would escape through any opening in enclosed chamber 32.

Accordingly, neither Lo, nor Lo with Bliss, teach or suggest "a tuning weight attached to an interior surface of said body combination; a faceplate; and wherein said body frame structure having a faceplate aperture distinct from said at least one body aperture, said faceplate aperture providing access to said hollow space and said tuning weight."

Finally, the Examiner has cited Anderson for its disclosure of a club head wherein the face plate is welded to the body (see page 3 of the Office Action). As previously amended and clarified herein by the cancelling of claims 3, 11, and 17-20, claim 1 recites "a faceplate receiving ridge upon which said faceplate is detachably retained on said body frame structure." Because welded is inconsistent with the faceplate being detachably retained, Applicant submits that Anderson teaches away from this claim limitation (see e.g., FIG. 5, reference numeral 14).

Because the combination of Lo with Anderson, Maxel, and/or Bliss does not disclose each and every element of the invention as claimed, Applicant requests withdrawal of this § 103 rejection of claim 1, as well as 2, 4, and 6-7 which depend therefrom.

Serial No. 10/712,401
40983.0500

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the currently pending claims 1-2, 4, and 6-7 properly set forth that which Applicant regards as his invention and are allowable over the cited prior art.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims. If it would be helpful, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (602) 382-6337 at the Examiner's earliest convenience. Applicants authorize and respectfully request that any fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-2814. This statement does NOT authorize charge of the issue fee.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 14, 2007

By: 

Eric M. Nielsen
Reg. No. 60,183

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
One Arizona Center
400 East Van Buren
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202
(602) 382-6572